

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RONALD F. MARTINEZ,

Plaintiff,

v.

C. RODRIGUEZ,

Defendant.

Case No.: 1:21-cv-01495-JLT-CDB

**ORDER RESOLVING PLAINTIFF'S
FILING OF AUGUST 22, 2025**

(Doc. 60)

Plaintiff Ronald F. Martinez is appearing pro se and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. section 1983.

I. RELEVANT BACKGROUND

On July 14, 2025, this matter was scheduled for a pre-settlement call on September 9, 2025, and a settlement conference on September 16, 2025, before Magistrate Judge Erica P. Grosjean. (*See* Doc. 56.)

On July 23, 2025, Magistrate Grosjean issued a minute order, advising the parties how to connect to the conference by providing the dial in number, meeting identification, and password. (*See* Docket Entry 58.)

On August 22, 2025, Plaintiff filed a document titled "Plaintiff's Motion for Clarification Regarding Magistrate Judge Erica P. Grosjean's Minute Order of 8/14/2025 [sic], Changing A zoom Video-Conference Call to a 'Conference Via Telephone.'" (Doc. 60.)

II. DISCUSSION

Plaintiff asserts the minute order issued, concerning a “different telephonic system,” does “not indicate if this ‘different telephone system’ is still a Video conference call.” (Doc. 60 at 2.) He states it is his position that “any Global settlement conference call be a videoconference call between the Court and Parties, and that a ‘telephonic’ conference call would dilute the importance and severity” of his rights. (*Id.*, emphasis in original) Plaintiff requests that “the Global Settlement conference Court schedule a Videoconference call if the new telephonic system is NOT Videoconference call for the September 16, 2025, at 1:00 p.m.” (*Id.*, emphasis in original.)

First, as indicated in the Court’s Order Setting Settlement Conference and Settlement Conference Procedures issued July 14, 2025, “a telephonic pre-settlement conference” was set for “**September 9, 2025, at 10:30 a.m.**, before Magistrate Judge Erica P. Grosjean.” (*See* Doc. 56 at 2, emphasis in original.) Second, Judge Grosjean’s minute order of July 23, 2025, specifically references the “telephonic Pre-Settlement Conference scheduled for September 9, 2025 at 10:30 a.m.,” and simply provides connection information. (*See* Docket Entry 58.) There has been no change to the *telephonic pre-settlement conference*: this pre-settlement conference has always been telephonic, and it remains so.

Next, the settlement conference is set for “**September 16, 2025, at 1:00 p.m.**, before Judge Grosjean, via Zoom videoconference.” (*See* Doc. 56 at 2, emphasis added.) And defense counsel was directed to “email Judge Grosjean’s courtroom deputy ... for the Zoom videoconference information.” (*Id.*) Further, the order indicates the Court would “also issue a writ of *habeas corpus ad testificandum* to allow for Plaintiff’s participation, as appropriate.” (*Id.*, italics in original.) No change has been made here either. The settlement conference itself will proceed on September 16, 2025, at 1:00 p.m. via Zoom videoconference before Judge Grosjean. The undersigned issued the Order & Writ of Habeas Corpus Ad Testificandum on August 1, 2025, “commanding the custodian to produce” Plaintiff “before Magistrate Judge Erica P. Grosjean, by Zoom video conference from his place of confinement, on Tuesday, **September 16, 2025, at 1:00 p.m.**” (Doc. 59, emphasis in original.)

1 In sum, Judge Grosjean's July 23, 2025, minute order concerned only the telephonic pre-
2 settlement conference. The settlement conference remains scheduled for September 16, 2025, at
3 1:00 p.m., and will occur via Zoom videoconferencing.

4 **III. CONCLUSION AND ORDER**

5 For the reasons stated above, the Court **HEREBY ORDERS** that Plaintiff's motion filed
6 August 22, 2025 (Doc. 60) is **RESOLVED**.

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: **August 26, 2025**


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE